## Exhibit C

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

VIRNET	X INC. AND	§		
LEIDOS,	INC.	§		
		§ Ci	Civil Action No. 6:12-cv-855-RWS	
		<b>§</b>		
Pla	aintiffs,	§		
		§		
v.		§		
ADDI E I	NC	8		
APPLE II	NC.	8 e 11	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
De	fendant.	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	JUNI INIAL DEMANDED	
	<u>v</u>	ERDICT FO	<u>ORM</u>	
			wall of the instructions provided by the Court each question must be unanimous.	
	used herein, "'135 patent" me . 7,490,151	eans U.S. Pater	ent No. 6,502,135; "'151 patent" means U.S.	
1. It has been previously determined that Apple's VPN on Demand infringes claims 1 and 7 of the '135 Patent and claim 13 of the '151 Patent. What royalty do you find, by a preponderance of the evidence, would fairly and reasonably compensate VirnetX for this infringement? Express your answer as a dollar amount per infringing device.				
	\$		per device	
Date:	<del></del>	В	By:  JURY FOREPERSON	
			JUNI PUNEI ENSUN	